

App F.IX-4

Revenue

1922 R3

File No. 264-22

Previous References

(Mur)

Serial Nos. 197

Later references.

SL-26✓

2500 27-1-5

" 1-29-28-29

" 131-31-1-8✓

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

" 401-33-1-2✓

" 379-39-1-4✓

" 276-63-1-2

Serial Nos.

Part B-for April 1926

SUBJECT

*Nor Kuthudass
Chaudes*

Dec. 13 17-21

Oct 17. 4. 26.

To the Secy. Comr

" Comptroller

" Dy. Comr. Mysore

" Rev. Comr.

" Supdt. R.S. & S.

Sanctions the restoration of to Smeas.
Smauschar & Sarsimachar of their Vistis
from the Pharis at Panchavahini

[Signature]

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

(Muznai)

NOTES.

File No.

FILE HEADING.

Review-application from Sumathi Anantchar
one of the Viltidars of Kow-C Krishnaji Doss
Sail's Agrahan at Solingapattam -

From

Sumathi Anantchar,

No.

Muznai

Dated

Received

2-10-1922

Diary No.

103

Enclos.

Spare Copies

Serial No.

BRIEF ABSTRACT OF LITTLR.

Review-application received
of K. S. Krishnaji Doss, one of the Viltidars of Kow-C Krishnaji Doss
in deposit of his land in 1894 was received
to him, and also now Kow-C Krishnaji Doss, he is now in the

NOTES AND ORDERS.

as he is 'Sipier' in the
in 1894 by K. S.

1 The review-application which has been
only stamped, was presented to the
Ist member of Council, who has been

Serial
No.

referred to the Rev. Secretary (Muzra),
The pet. Sumati Anantachari
is one of the Kuttichars of Nool
Krishna Doss Sait's Agraham at
Seringapatam.

The Serial under ref. to
in the review-application have
been flagged.

The facts of this case have
been noted at sufficient length
in the office-notes of the ref.
file & herewith submit.

Sumati Anantachari - one of
the Kuttichars stated that he had
built the Agraham house on the
site selected at Seringapatam
and prayed for the restoration
of his Kutti, and payment of
the Kutti arrears due to him.

In G.O. no. 3110-12/Muz.
696-15 of 5-3-1921, Govt have
observed that being Agraharam
houses, it is an essential
condition for the continuance
of the Kuttis or their equivalents
or even for the payment of

several
the ref. file & had
been put up for
ref. in connection
with a memorial
from another Kuttichar
Chasiramedda Dasappa
Nasimachari.

Serial
No.

G.

D.

appears that the houses should be owned and occupied only by Brahmans. So far as Sumati Anantachari, the petitioner, is concerned, it is held that this condition has not been fulfilled, since the use of the building as a girls' school cannot be considered equivalent to its occupation by a Brahman. His petition was rejected in order no. 3196 of 12-3-1921.

His review application was rejected in subsequent order no. 697 of 11.8.1922.

7 He has put in ^{another} a review application praying that as he has fulfilled the conditions of the award grant, the writte and the arrears due to him up to date may be refunded to him.

As regards the use of the building as a girls' house, the petition has given reasons which necessitated the re-^{con-}struction

Serial
No.

of the building for purposes of the Girls' School. He submits that the building was actually occupied by Brahmans for 5 or 6 years, that as it was rather difficult to procure a Brahman Tenant for the house owing to scarcity of water, the fear of the insecurity of life and property due to the house being isolated and at a distance from the town, and as the building also required some repairs, he rented out the building to a school for 2 or 3 years with the knowledge of the Muznai Secretary, and that he has preserved satisfactory evidence to show that the rent to the extent of Rs 100/- was exclusively ^{used for the repairs of the} building. ^{He says that the building is since occupied by Brahmans} He further submits that the Kithivars of Konamuz are enjoying their Kithivars though they live in different places. Attention is respectfully

Serial
No.

na 22 in muz
no. 696-15-
Page 9)

B,

page 13 of the office
note

initiated in this connection by
The late muz. Secretary Mr
G. Aravamudan's note stating
that the original sanction of the
late Highness relating to the
Agarhar Vithis etc. does not
include the condition that the
an actual residence of the
Vithidars in the Agarhar
houses is essential.

In G.O. no. 745-6 D of 17-8-1904,
The General Vithidars were given
a final chance with one year's
time to construct houses on the
sites selected by the Dy. Commr.
at Seringapatam. In the latest
file no 146 21 on the subject
dealing with the petitions of
Sahasranamada Laxshmi-
narasimhan, and Sumathi Prasad
Chari, The Govt Advocate to
whom the papers went up
for opinion, has stated that
it is evident that this
condition has not been
fulfilled within the time limit.

Serial
No.

fixed. In para 3 of his present Review-petition, Sumasi Anantachari has tried to show that he constructed the building within the time limit on the plan approved by the Municipality in license no. 18728-1-1908. Para 3 of the 10) Before disposing of the present review-petition, may the file be called upon to produce documentary evidence in support of the above allegation? Submit for orders.

AV
8-12-1922.

AV
8/12/22

Plan duplicate

AV
8/12/22

10
Draft. requiring submit. as directed.

AV
18-12-1922.

AV
15/12/22

Done
15/12/22

AV
11/12/22
waited upon the
Secretary.
AV
12.

Serial
No.

2

no. 1912. D. 18/12/22 to and
D.C. of Mysore, thro' Secy. Comr.

Requests him to furnish
certain information with regard
to his house at Seringapatam
and the tax paid on them

From, the Secy Comr.

Letter no. C. 884 D. 12-11-23

W.

Submits Mysore Dy Comr's
communication furnishing the
required information, and states
that the further report refd. to
by the Dy. Comr. has been called
for, and will be forwarded on
receipt.

From the Dy. Comr's report,
it is seen that Sumati Hanthachar
had built the house by about
October 1905 and that Municipal
Tax was first levied on this
house in the year 1906-07
As regard Sahasranamada
Lakshmi Narasimhaiah, it
is reported that he applied
for the license to build the
house in January 1905

x
is within one year
from the date of his
having been com-
municated of the
govt. order -

Serial
No.

and built the house, that as this house became dilapidated owing to its not having been occupied, it was repaired during 1915-6 after obtaining a license, and that the house is under occupation by Lakshmi Narasimhaiah since then. The Municipal tax was levied for the first time during 1916-7.

13 The further report promised may be awaited.
Submitted.

M 15/11/23 *84* 16/11/23 *75* 19.11.23

4 To the Muznai Commr. No. 883 d. 5.1.24.
Forwards another appⁿ no. 754 d. 22.12.24 from Gumat Anantachari and requests him to send up the further report promised by him.

5 From, the Muz. Commr

Letter no. C. 886 d. 25.4.24.

Forwards Mysore Deputy Commissioner's communication furnishing further information.

Serial
No.

X

On The Subject

15 The Dy Commr reports that Sumati Anantachar built the house in the Agrahar about October 1905, and that the Municipal tax was first levied on this house in the year 1906-07. It is thus seen that this individual has built the house within the time limit prescribed in the order of 1904, and the statement contained in the ^{which has led to error Dy 11-8-1922} ~~Govt Advocate's~~ note Dy 18.5.1922 is not correct in the case of this Kithi-dar.

D,
N,

16 As regards Lakshmi Nara-Sinhaachar, it is reported that he first obtained a license on 30-1-1905 from the Vice President of S. Patam Taluk Municipality for constructing the house, and that as it could not be constructed then owing to some inconvenience, he obtained a fresh license for the 2nd time on 13-9-1915.

18

Muzrai
Secretariat

Muz. File No. 264 of 1922

Serial
No.

and constructed the house afterwards, and that the municipal tax on this house was levied for the first time during 1916-17. The Dy. Commr. states that this Vithidam did not construct the house within the time limit prescribed in the G.O. of 15th Aug. 1906.

Enclosed for records.

AY
15.5.1924
19

The facts connected with this old question have been reiterated many a time since 1894. A full note up to 1921 is contained in pages 33-50 of the file no 696 of 1915 (H D) bearing Govt. G.O. of 5th March 1921 (H C). The matter was resumed in 1894, but in the representation of the Agraharika Vithidam, they were told in order dated 2nd of 1894 that the Govt. would contribute ^{partially} the cost.

M

Serial
No.

2L A1

2L B1

portions within the Vithi or their Equivalent after they build their aparthans, in a locality approved by the Dy. Commr, & otherwise conform to the conditions of the original grant. A final chance for conforming with the conditions was given in the Govt No 745-B Muz F No 81-94 dated 17th Aug 1904, in which one year's time was given. Thereupon, two of the Vithidars Sumaki Ananthachari & S. Lakshminarasimachari built the houses & began to apply for the areas of Vithi in accordance with the order of Dec 1894. The former built the house within a year & the latter about 1915. After a detailed Enquiry Govt passed orders in March 1921, refusing the claim of Ananthachari, as he had let out his house to the Girls' School, instead of himself or another Mahant living there. ~~S. Lakshminarasimachari~~ The claim of S. Lakshminarasimachari was admitted, although he built the temple long after the stipulated time, but restricted the claim to the areas from 1886-1894, & relies on the Order of 25.12.1898 (2L B). But this Order relates only to previous areas & ~~cannot~~ cannot be said to have superseded the promise of restoring the Vithi.

2111 107

Serial
No.

given in the End of Dec 1894, as much as the existence of the promise was fully recognized in the later Order of 1904, giving one year's time to build his house. After this once some accounts have been laid down two people (vide 71 V).

Since the Order of 1904, the two people have been awaiting for the payment of the arrears up to date, stating that they have fulfilled the condition. As regards Dattashenkarum Sunkha char, Govt. refuses to reconsider the Order (vide End of 11 8-22). Sumathi Ananthachari has been repeatedly petitioning Govt. He says he has since rented the house to a Brahmin & further says that if the arrears of Vritti due to him & the Vritti itself for the future are given to him, he is prepared to give up his present occupation as Schoolmaster & live in the aforesaid house. It is admitted that his applicant was the only one to build the house within the stipulated time, & as much as the End of Dec 1894, he promised to restore the Vritti, & if he has been built etc. & the Order of 1904 gave one year's time, and that the applicant built the house in one year as stipulated & has now given the house to a Brahmin & occupation. It is for consideration if the applicant's case may not be viewed with favour.

HDI

W + 20.

691/29.5
Recd. Secy
11/11/2210/6/22
10/6/22

General and Revenue
Secretariat

File No. 264

of 1922.

Serial
No.

2

The pekhni Sumat Ananthachari
has applied for the refund of the Vork
amount held to date for 1894. & also
for the restoration of the Vork.

A reference is made to the person who
has been for a long time in the
of the Vork amount, and for the
1887-1894. The person who has been
in the account with the Vork, and
[vide note in file no 676], it would appear
that the Vork amount has been paid to
the person who has been in the
1908-1909 [vide para 2 of the note in
146-21]. How this person came to
be made is not clear.

2-7-22 I should like to have definite &
correct information on the following points
i.e. what year has been paid to
the person who has been in the
Vork account, and from what year
has the person been in the Vork.

- (2) What year has been paid to the person who has been in the Vork account, and from what year has the person been in the Vork.
- (3) The person who has been in the Vork account, and from what year has the person been in the Vork.
- (4) The person who has been in the Vork account, and from what year has the person been in the Vork.

It has been recently reported that
there is a person who has been in the
Vork account, and from what year has the person been in the Vork.

2-9-22

2-9-22

793

21/11/22

Serial
No.

waited upon the
88th Secretary
in instructions
on 10.9.22
AV

Dft. enclosing Submits.

AV
23/11.9.22. 9/11.22
Issue
13.9.22.

6 To the Muzrai Comm^{ee}. No. 420 d. 18.9.24.
Requests him to furnish further info on cer-
tain points on the above subject

7 From, The Muzrai Comm^{ee}
Letter no C. 391 d. 1.12.24.

Promises to submit a
detailed report on receipt of
the Dy. Commr's. reply in this matter.
It will be seen from the
Dy. Commr's. present report
no. C. 391 d. 25.11.1924 that
Sumati Anantachari has
given his Agrahar house at
Seringapatam for the occupation
of the Acharya of Sri Ranga
natha Swamy temple.

He promises further report
may be awaited.

Submit 12/12/24 13/12/24
AV 20/12/22

1367
1850Serial
No.

6.

From, the Muz. Comr.
Letter no. 882 of 6/1925.

Submits for three reports
called for in sl. 6.

1) The Sub Divl. Officer's
Report of 15-4-1925 explains
the facts of the case.

2) Re the queries raised in sl. 6,
it is submitted that the inam
Villages are situated in the
T. narasipura Taluk and that
no accounts of income and exps.
are available both in Seringa-
pattam and T. narasipura Taluk.

3) In the matter of payments
to Vettidars, the following
information is submitted:-

i) Sumathi Anantachari:-
Advance of Rs 450/- was given
on 16-11-1905 and Anantachari
paid Muz. Tax on 18/11/05

Serial
No.

A further sum of Rs 309-5-10 was paid on 7-4-1910 to him.

(ii) Lakshmi Narasimhaiah:-

Sums of Rs 500/- and Rs 400 were advanced to him on 13-5-1915 and 28-3-1917 respectively -

(iii)

A. Narasimhaiah. Advance - paid Rs 500 - 26-5-15

(iv) P. Subba Rao. Rs 500 - 10-6-16

(v) Srinivasa Murthi. 500 - 4-8-15

(vi) Anantamurtachar - 500 - 13-1-19

(vii) Kuppanna - 500 - 13-8-1915

The Smt. Anantachar's Agrahar house at S. Patam, the Amildar of S. Patam Taluk reports that this house has been given for the occupation of Kesava Ranga Bhakta

K

Serial
No.

The United States
Senate yesterday
who was present with
yesterday said that
the tenant has given
a marriage & has thought
temporary looked the
house at.

84
15.6-257

While the Sub Dirl Officer
states that it is now vacant
and that the doors have
been closed and locked.

Submitted

AY

1676-25

Sumati Ananthachari has her entry
up to ¹⁰⁰ just now. Please put it up.

Mean also note ~~that~~ the new road that
would be open to them has people from ^{the town} ~~the town~~.
When the Inca was resumed.

17.6.25

3/ Petition no. 1881 presented
by Sumati Anantachau praying
that he may be heard in
person before orders are passed,
is placed on the file.

32 The amounts due up to the end of 1917-8 to each of the 2 Kithidars is noted below:—

Sumati Anantachar — 2417-9-4.
Sahasra namas

Laoshtani Nana Simha } - 2417-9-4-
Sindhu -char

M 19.6.25 84 19.6.25 84 19.6.25 84 19.6.25 84

Unfortunately all his ~~his~~ personal files have not
been put up. Put up all the available
papers from 1886.

23.625

All the previous files are submitted.
Submitted.

44
23/6/25

864 Please put up a copy of the Porro no
825-6 dated 11-8-1904. Also ~~write~~ ask
the Mr. Diehl (W. S. Ave. line) ~~who else~~
has if any other millers or millers have
built ^{built} ~~the~~ houses, ~~who~~ if so when
completed & when Mr. L. was paid, and
how they are making use of the houses,
and what their share is in the same.

24.625.

The financial order is being
backed - A Jfr Hukens & The
Auditor is submit for appl. or
orders.

26.6.25

Done
26 6.15.

(P)

3 The Amildar of S Patana reports that besides Sumati Amantachare and Lakshmi Narayan Sinha, another Kithiclar

NOTE-Contn Sheet
Varadach

File No.

of 19 .

Serial
No.

Serial
No.

has raised a half-constructed building, which is vacant and on which no municipal Kandaya has been imposed.

Submtr. The Financial
Adm. of 1904 is
said to be not
feasible.
8d
14725

37 not with reference to members' minutes on page 3 of the note.

The position as indicated in file 696 of 15 and 146 of 21 seems to be a mistake due to some misconception. The question of the payment of Vitti amount from 1886 to 1894 has been finally decided in

C. No. 797-8 Mar 73-94 dated 25.12.1898 (vide para 3 thereof).

Refce is also invited to statement flagged A. Submitter by the Dy. Commr in 1909. ^{which shows} that the amount due to the two

Muzrai
Secretariat

Muz. File No. 77 of 1922

Serial
No.

applicants now in question viz
Lakshminarasimhaiah and
Sumathi Ananthachari had already
been paid to them, ~~among~~ among
others before that date. It will also
~~be~~ seen from this statement that
after 1894, the amount has not
been paid to any within for any year
except to the temple. What is now
prayed for by the two persons is the
payment of the amount from
1894 up to date. No mistake in the
order in File no 696-15 Serials 1-13
is responsible for the mistake in
the C.O. of 5th March 1921,
in para 4 of which, while admitting
the correctness of the claim made by
Lakshminarasimhaiah, and rejecting
that of Sumathi Ananthachari on the
ground that he has given the order to
the A. School, Govt. orders the
payment of the amount from 1886-
to 1894 to Lakshminarasimhaiah.

H.C.

22

Serial
No.

is clear from the report that Sumanthi
Ananthachari, chiefly complies with the
order of 1904 as far as the land in
hand is concerned, but as regards the
construction of the new stipulated
Lakshmanan Agraharam and as regards to
have attended to the building and some
other matters that off the construction
has not yet been commenced. It is noted that the
compliance with the order of 1904 is not
complete as the land in hand is not yet
clear. He has been residing in the
in the village since 1911. Since the
Ananthachari has been a school,
and then when Government decided to the compliance
of the order of 1904, he gave it
to the Archak of the Rangamahal Sree
Temple who also seems to have
looked into the matter. The order of 1904 is
upheld as of 4-25-11. The same is
being kept in the files, therefore, the
objections are

Pl. 1

- 1) The then the titles should be returned
to the two applicants.
- 2) If so, at what form or value or
money equivalent.
- 3) If it is from what year the amount
of rent is to be paid to them.
As per 11, Lakshmanan Agraharam

File No.

of 19 '12

General and Revenue
Secretariat.

Serial
No.

through the design, construction, the building of
yashwanthji, 109 E. ...
however, the ...
being in it, the being ...
that is ...
Such as that ...
have, ...
in him; but ...
able to keep ...
of the ...
would go and ...
if the ...
C ...
with ...
in ...
the ...
for ...
that it would set an example to others, ...
the ...
As regards the 2nd point
it would be ...
desirable to go ...
guide them. A ...
a better ...
adopted ...
the ...
villages ...
As ...
be safely said that ...

22. W

22. V

29 M

22 B

75

Serial
No

Vithi manbharai has been the one of completion of the transaction. C. 2

1874 re. advance due to Anan. Thakur. From 1905-06 grant to Dattabhai and others. From 1916-17. As per the receipt, grant to Dattabhai, the Dy. Comm. made the grant. The Dy. Comm. is a private dealer, the Dy. Comm. may be asked to prepare a final bill in favour of the people, with reference to the receipt of the village for the year 1916-17.

In this case, a final bill deduction has to be made of the amount paid as advance to the people for the year 1916-17. In C. 2. No 611 & 2 dated 13.7.07, a sanction was accorded to the payment of advance of Rs 450-0-0 + Rs 309-5-10 = Rs 759-5-10 to Sumatla Anantachari, & of Rs 500 to Dattabhai and others; but it is reported that an additional sum of Rs 400 was given to the latter on 28th March 1917, thus making the total due from him Rs 900.

Under the cover of the above quoted order advances have also been made to 5 other individuals as shown below

A Narasimhaiah
P. Subba Rao

Rs 500
on 26.5
Rs 500 on 10.6

File No.

of 197

Serial
No.

Dickins, Maria
 Joan the Smith
 Knappe, Maria

By order of the Court, this 4th day of June, 1915.

1. 12, 500 to 13, 000

Prob. 2. 13. 8 f/91.

[illegible]

Unit 4
for order.

No Reg
 43
 Super. all well
 at 2 PM
 24.7

The Rev Sec could not find time to go through these papers worth the sea and has therefore asked the papers to be submitted to his successor.

In ¹⁵⁷ Murray's Index note
of 4. 11. 20, pages 33 to 46. in
Murray file 696. of 1915 - 16.
Sub? for reference and the present
Admiral's Secretary's note
dated the 20th July 1925, both
rec. together give a connected
history of the case and the
points

Serial
No

old Division
in the West
order to be
out

119

points for orders.

By

17.8.25

Resdce 3)

Vide my
note - Sept.
hwy - up
Tong -

h
19.6.

File No.

of 19 .

General and Revenue
Secretariat

Serial
No.

File No. 27-28

45

I am afraid the issues in the case have been mixed up and the notes are conflicting.

The main question is the interpretation of the G.O. of 25th Dec. 1898 regarding the payment of the arrears of Vritti amounts. This order which was not in the file is now put up for reference. In Muz. File 696^x-15-11 the interpretation to be put on this order was exhaustively discussed and it was held that the

question of restoration of the Vritti^S or ~~the~~ *the equivalent to the Vritti* did not at all arise as the conditions laid

down in G.O. of 2-12-1894 had not been fulfilled and that the payment of the arrears of Vritti amounts to such of the Vrittidars as had built houses referred only to the period 1886 to 1894 (i.e. the date of resumption of the village). It would however appear that the Dy. Commr. considered the G.O. of 25-12-98 as absolutely authorising payment of Vritti amounts up to 1894 to all the Vrittidars on expressing their willingness to build houses in the sites proposed by them and that the payment of the arrears up to 1894 had actually been made before G.O. of 5-3-1921 issued.

Further in accordance with the order of 24th ¹⁵ ~~July~~ ^{Aug 1908} 1908 advances for building houses out of the Vritti amounts in arrears had also been made. The G.O. of 5-3-1921 has been practically inoperative, for, while it did not benefit Lakshminarasimbachar whose case was favourably considered it in no way prejudicially affected Ananthachari in so far as the payment of arrears of Vritti up to 1894 was concerned. The claims of both those people

x J.

x C

x H₁

x J.

x C

x B₁

29 26/10/22

for payment of the proportionate Vritti amounts accruing from 1894 on the ground that they have conformed to the condition of building houses in the sites allotted to them have to be reconsidered.

45 I do not think that the notes furnish definite and correct information on the several points asked by the Member in his minute dated 3-9-24 page 13. So far as I can gather from the file the following answers can be given:

Question 1. Up to what year has the petitioner Sumathi Ananthachar been paid his Vritti and from what year has payment been withheld?

Answer.- Payment has been made in full up to 1894 and advances for building a house have been since made Viz: Rs. 450/- on 16th Nov. 1905 and Rs. 309-5-10 on 7th Apl. 1912 - Total Rs. 759-5-10.

Question 2. - What is the year up to which payment has been made to Lakshminarasimhachar?

Answer - To this gentleman also the arrears up to 1894 have been paid and advances of Rs. 500/- on 13-5-1915 and Rs. 400/- on 28-3-1917 have been made for building a house.

Question 3. - Are there any other Vrittidars to whom the arrears have been paid and if so up to what year?

Answer - Five other Vrittidars have also been paid the arrears up to 1894 and an advance of Rs. 500/- has been made to each of them on the dates as under:

Narasimhaia	...	on 26-5-1915
P. Subba Rao		10-6-1916
Srinivasamurti		4-8-1915
Anantanurthachar		13-1-1919 ✓
Kupamma		13-8-1918

It is not clear under what authority the several advances were made by the Deputy Commissioner. The order of 1006 authorises the advance being made only out of the arrears not accrued up to 1894. Of course the De-

puty

11/12/22 - 22-30
3.

Deputy Commissioner interpreted the order of 1898 as an unconditional order entitling the Vrittidars to ~~set the~~ ^{claim the} arrears irrespective of their completing the houses and living in them. This view is supported ⁱⁿ by Govt. Advocate's opinion recorded on 18-5-1922 (Flag U). Whatever justification there might have been for the payment of the arrears prior to 1894 the Dy. Commr. was not at all in order in having made any advance as against Vritti amounts relating to subsequent years. In fact an explanation of the Dy. Commr. was called for in this Office No. 1232 dated 7-9-1921 ^X but no reply is forthcoming.

x P.

Question 4 - Has the statement made by Ananthachar that he has recently rented his house to a Brahmin been verified and if so by Whom ?

Answer. Yes. By the Amildar and Sub-Division Officer. The building which was at first rented out to a School was later on given to one of the Archaks of Sri Ranganatha Swami Temple. It is since reported to be vacant doors being locked.

48 The question of restoration of the village to the Vrittidars or the grant of a cash ~~sum~~ equivalent to them does not now arise as Govt. have refused to reopen it more than once. Whether rightly or wrongly all the Vrittidars have been paid their arrears from the date of attachment to the date of resumption 1886 to 1894 and it is not worthwhile raking up this question. The ^{case} ~~claims~~ of Sumathi Ananthachar and Lakshminarasimhachar who have built their houses in the sites allotted to them on the understanding that their Vritti would be restored, deserve some favourable consideration.

31 Ma 20/21

In the circumstances brought to light both may be equally treated and as a matter of grace half the proportionate Vritti amounts due to each of them up to the passing of C.O. of 5th March 1921 i.e. 1920-21. deduction, the amounts already advanced may be paid over to them in final adjustment of their claims.

x e

50 As regards the other five Vrittiders who have taken advance of Rs. 500 but have not built houses, the Dy. Commr. should be asked to take action to recover the amounts from them. If it is not possible to get back these amounts they will have to be written off.

32/10
19/10
1/2 minutes

h
19/10/21
Revenue Secretary.

O R D E R.

51

I have carefully gone through all the previous papers relating to the case. Though it is only the review application of Sumati Ananthachar that has to be dealt with in this file, I think it is desirable that the whole case -relating to the restoration of the Agrahar vritties in question and the payment of the arrears of allowance to the several vrittidars- should be gone into thoroughly and disposed of once for all.

52

X B,

2. In Government Order dated 25th December 1898, the right of the several Agrahar Inamdars to their respective shares in the income from the villages during the years 1886 to 1894 (during which the Inam was under Government management) was recognised by Government. Subsequently, however, in their Order dated 17th August 1904, Government authorised the Deputy Commissioner to advance to the vrittidars, out of the arrears of vritti amount due to them for the years 1886 to 1894, only such amount as may be required by them for building houses on the sites selected for the purpose at Seringapatam, the advances being made on proper and adequate security. It was also laid down in the order that, in case the vrittidars failed to build the Agrahar houses on the selected site within one year from the date of the order, the promise made in the Government Order of 1894 to restore the vritties or their equivalent to the Inamdars would be withdrawn and cancelled.

53

X B,

3. Of the several vrittidars, only one person -Sumati Ananthachar-conformed to the conditions laid down in the order of 17th August 1904 by building a house on the site in 1905. He did not however, live in the house, but rented it out to others.

54

4. Another vrittidar -Lakshminarasimhachar- has also built a house on the site; but this, he did, nearly 10 years after the expiry of the period of one year fixed by Government in their order of August 1904, for compliance with its terms; and he is therefore strictly not entitled to the concession of the restoration of his vritti or its equivalent, in accordance with the order of 1894.

x B,

55

5. The other vrittidars have not built any houses even up to now, and they must therefore be considered to have completely forfeited all claim to the restoration of their vritties or their equivalent.

x
J + B,

56

6. Though under the Government Orders dated 25th December 1898 and 17th August 1904 the vrittidars were to be given advances only to the extent of the vritti amounts respectively due to them for the years 1886-1894 during which the Inam was under Government management before its resumption by Government, it would appear that they have been given much larger advances, (far in excess of the arrears for 1886-1894) ^{some} the payments having been made so late as 1915 and 1916 [without any authorization by Government.] No explanation has been furnished for such unauthorized payments, though it was called for by Government.]

57

7. I think that the several cases may now be disposed of as follows:-

(1) Case of Sumati Ananthachar.

This gentleman constructed his house on the selected site in the year 1905-06 in accordance with the Govt. Order of August 1904; and though he had rented it for sometime for a school, it is said that the house is now occupied by one of the Brahmin Archaks of the Seringapatam

temple in accordance with the order of Government. In the circumstances, the irregularity on his part in renting out the house to non-Brahmins for some years until it was pointed out by Government, may be condoned and his vritti allowance, may be restored to him from 1905-06 when he completed the construction of his house, and sanction may be accorded to the payment to him of the arrears from 1905-06 up to date [in addition to that for the years 1886-1894 already sanctioned by Government] after deducting therefrom the amounts already advanced to him.

(2) Lakshminarasimhachar.


55 This gentleman is, as already observed, not strictly entitled to the restoration of his vritti, as he did not comply with the terms of the Government Order of August 1904 by building his house within the period of one year stipulated therein. However, as he has constructed the house so far back in 1915-16 nearly 10 years ago, the delay on his part in complying with the time prescribed in the order of 1904 may be condoned as a concession and his vritti allowance restored to him from the time of the completion of the house i.e. from 1915-16. The arrears of his allowance from 1915-16 up to date [plus the arrears for the years 1886-1894 the payment of which has already been sanctioned by Government] may be paid to him after deducting therefrom the amounts already advanced *h. h. m.*

59 In the event of the payments already made to Anantha char and Lakshminarasimhachar being in excess of the arrears due to them as mentioned above, such excess may be adjusted by short drawal from payments that may become due to them in future years.

(3) *Other Vrittids*

60 (3) In respect of the other vrittidadars who have not built houses till now, they will be considered to have completely forfeited their right to the restoration of their vritties and they will be called on to repay the advances ^{made} ~~unauthorisedly~~ made to them in excess of the arrears due to them for the years 1886-1894. [The explanation of the officers responsible for the unauthorised excess payments made to these persons will also be called for again and obtained with a view to consider the question of enforcing their responsibility for making ^{good} ~~out~~ the amount if it cannot be realised from the persons concerned.]

61 8. The next point is how the share of the annual vritti allowance due to Ananthachar and lakshminarasimhachar is to be calculated after the village was taken over under Government management. In the case of the vritties - assigned to the temple and the chattram, they have been commuted into money payments at the rate of Rs.72 per vritti after the villages came under Government management; and I think both Ananthachar and lakshminarasimhachar may be paid at the same rate (Rs.72 per annum) in respect of the ~~vritti~~ ^{vrittis} vritti owned by each of them; and they may be declared to be entitled to this grant - in hereditary ~~succession~~ ^{inheritance} - so long as the houses are maintained in a habitable condition and are actually occupied by Brahmins. With a view to ensure that this condition is not infringed or lost sight of, it may be ordered that the payment of the grant, - at the rate of ~~Rs.72 per annum~~ ^{Rs.72} stated above, ~~shall~~ ^{will} be made ~~annually~~ at the Taluk Treasury once a quarter on the production of a certificate signed by the Vice-President or President of the Seringapatam Municipality or by the Amildar of the Taluk, that the houses are in good and habitable condition and are occupied by Brahmins.



62 This may be submitted to the Dewan; if he agrees to the proposals made ^{for} ~~the~~ a final order will be passed for the payment to the ~~Taluk~~ ^{Dewan} ~~Treasury~~ ^{of the} ~~once a quarter~~ ^{same} ~~at the Taluk Treasury~~ ^{to the} ~~once a quarter~~ ^{Dewan}

11/11/25

Parker in the
 2nd app's letter
 suggested in the
 present paragraph
 might be added on
 1/12

October 3
 10/12/57

With reference to para 6 and the
 last portion of para 8 of the D.P. A. I
 beg to submit that the paragraphs were
 authorized by Govt. L. 70 Y, 10, 8.6.9
 Hence it is that I had omitted them in
 my draft. These portions are of minor
 value even now. 10/12/57

Serial
No

63

Letter (the) received & has
made change 4

12.11.25
18.11.25
18/11

D.F.R. Submitted.

AV
25.11.25
4/12/25

~~The patient made in return~~
~~Prinil in the new process 6-7-25~~
D.F.R. revised & put up.

Rev. Secy
18.12.25

8.12.25

8/12

66 Please see no

remarks on page 2 of the D.F.R.

9/12

67

D.F.R. Revised and re-submitted
as directed.

AV
10.12.25 12-25

68
Rev. Secy

14.12.25

In the light of the app's note
the question requires further elucidation. There

The delay was due
to the fact that the
Branch took some
time to study the
case, & again the
draft put up
was being full,
a revised D.F.R.
had to be put up.

Delay has been
avoided.
The office had not
much to do. 4

8/12

App. F. III—2]

File No.

of 192 .

Serial
No

are 5 Vaidikars who have been given advances
of Rs 500 each & who have not built houses -

They are - 1 A Nannimale.

2. P. Subba Rao.

3. Srinivas Murthi.

4. Ananth Murthi adan

5. Kuppa anna -

69 It will be seen from the references put up
that there is first order for sanctioning the advance
6- nos 2 & 4. They x & y -

70 What is the authority for the advance 6
The order -

71. The Govt of 21st July 1907 & 25th June 1911;
may also be put up or flagged -

In any case the Security fund has been
expended in this case as they have not yet
built the houses -

(Routine note given)

$\frac{16}{14/12}$
15.12 as.

✓ Govt orders sanctioning advances
to Vaidikars 1 to 4 in para 68
Supra, are indicated below:-

1. Alur Narasimhiah -

in G.O. no 1812-3 Dy 11-2-1915.
muz. 290-14-5

2. P. Subba Rao -

in G.O. no. 1578-9 Dy 3-1-1916.

3. Srinivasa murthi.

in G.O. no 1810-11 Dy 11-2-1915
muz. 290-14-3

A

X

B

Note-Contn. Sheet

and as the above notes show that.

Note-Contn Sheet

the

File No.

of 192 .

Serial
No.

NOTE—Contn. Sheet

Serial
No

(1 in monthly Acc.
Vol. of June 1917)
File no. 696-15-K-
does not contain the
order

D

f

4. Anantamurtiyachan

in G.O. no. 3126-4 D 25-6-1917
muz. 696-15-3and in G.O. no. 825-6 D 7-9-1918
muz. 178-18-2G.O. orders D 31-7-1907 and
25-6-1917 are flagged.

Submtd. for orders. Re Kittidar

AV
19.1.26.Kuppamma,
G.O. is notBh
20.1.26 73 ~~readily~~ traceable[The Amildar, Singapore,
who was specially written to, says
also that no info is available
in his office, as regards Kuppamma
(76 E)]DFN is fully
referenced.Ref:- Rev. Secy's Ltr
(Para 68 - 1st Note)

Rev. Secy

J. -
- 10/174 Ref:- 1st members order - D.
9.12.25. vide. para. 3. of the draft
originally put up.75 The omission has been supplied
in para 7 of the revised draft.76 In this connection it has to be
stated as the above notes show that.

The

File No.

of 192 .

General and Revenue
Secretariat

Serial
No.

Serial
No

advances made in the type - perhaps in
one can ~~be~~ cannot - be characterized as
humanitarian. The object of duty mainly
lay in not improving the terms of the Mukden
Tika under which the advances were made.
(A) Right-Vital alterations seem necessary
in paras 6 & 10 of the draft - notwithstanding

518
21/1

77 181 member)

1
20-1-46

(A) I shall for glass of the Review
with moderate ^{in the drop internal} ^{what} alterations he
has suggested in paras 6 & 10

79 D 7 N is app

for copy may be put up
for signature

24/1

the discussion with
P. A. and going this.
papers, I think it
necessary that - certain
vital alterations should
be made in the D. 7. N.
I have indicated them
in pencil - in paras
1, 2 & 4. Para 6 is
imposing and had
better be omitted.

181 member) 1
27/1

17.12.1926
60.75

D. 7. N. copy signed by the first
member - D. S. N. is sub.
(The defects in the D. 7. N. have been
duly flagged)

16.2-26

D. S. N., Submitted
for approval.

Dewan)

17/2

File No.

of 192 .

General and Revenue
Secretariat

Serial
No.

Final Note by the First Member of Council.

Subject:—

Re the claim of Sumati Anantachar and Lakshminarasimhachar, Vrittildars of Nowl Krishna Doss Agrahar at Seringapatam, for the restoration of their Vrittis and for the payment of arrears of Vritti allowances.

✓ The villages of Turuganur and Basavanahalli in the T. Narsipur Taluk were granted as Sarvamanya by His Highness the Maharaja Krishnaraja Wodeyar to Nowl Krishna Doss by Sannad dated 8th March 1820 for the maintenance of certain charitable institutions viz. a chattram, a temple and an Agrahar at Paschimavahini. The -- villages were registered during the Inam Settlement as Devadaya grant to be held by the Manager for the time being of the charities established by Nowl Krishna Doss. As the charities were neglected, and no Agrahar was built, the villages were taken under Government management in 1886 and subsequently resumed to Government in Government Order No.963-6/G.199 dated 16th July 1894.

2. On the representation made by the Vrittildars it was directed in Government Order No.9047-48/R.1369 dated 2nd December 1894 that the question of restoring to them the Vrittis or their equivalents would be favourably considered, if they should build their Agrahar houses in a locality approved by the Deputy Commissioner and otherwise conform to the conditions of the original grant. In Government Order No.797-8/Muz.31-94 dated 25th December 1898, the right of the several Agrahar inamdars to their respective shares in the - income from the villages during the years 1886 to 1894 (during which the Inam was under Government management) was recognised, and in their order No.745-6 dated 17th August 1904 Government authorised the Deputy Commissioner to advance to the Vrittildars out of the arrears of Vritti amount due to them for the years 1886 to 1894, such amounts as may be required by them for building houses on the sites selected for the purpose at Seringapatam after

taking proper and adequate security therefor. It was also laid down that in case the vrittidars failed to build the Agrahar houses on the selected site within one year from the date of the order, the promise made in Government Order of 2nd December 1894 to restore the Vritti or their equivalents to the Inamdars would be withdrawn and cancelled.

3. Of the several vrittidars, only one person Sumati Ananthachar conformed to the conditions laid down in the order of the 17th August 1904 by building a house on the site in 1905. He did not however, live in the house, but rented it out to -- others.

4. Another vrittidar - Lakshminarasinhachar has also built a house on the site; but this he did nearly 10 years after the expiry of the period of one year fixed by Government in their order of August 1904 for compliance with its terms, and he is therefore strictly not entitled to the concession of the restoration of his vritti or its equivalent, in accordance with the order of 1894.

5. The other vrittidars have not built any houses even up to now, and they must therefore be considered to have completely forfeited all claim to the restoration of their villages or their equivalent.

6. Though under the Government Orders dated 25th December 1898 and 17th August 1904 the vrittidars were to be given advances only to the extent of the vritti amounts respectively due to them for the years 1886-1894 during which the Inam was under Government management before its resumption by Government it would appear that they have been given much larger advances, (far in excess of the arrears for 1886-1894), some of the payments having been made so late as 1915 and 1918.

7. Sumathi Ananthachar and Lakshminarasinhachar who had constructed houses, claimed their share of the Vritti amounts from

K 1894. After a detailed enquiry and good deal of correspondence, orders were passed in March 1921 refusing the claim of Ananthachar on the ground that he had let out the building for a girls' school in contravention of the terms of the grant, viz. that it should be occupied by a Brahmin resident. The claim of lakshminarasimhachar was partially admitted, being restricted to the payment of the -- arrears from 1886 to 1894. Neither of them has been satisfied with the order. Sumathi Ananthachar who is reported to have subsequently rented out his house to one of the Archaks of the Sri Ranganathaswami temple has applied for a review of the order of Government.

8. Though it is only the review application of Sumathi Ananthachar that has to be dealt with in this file, it is considered desirable that the whole case relating to the restoration of the Agrahar Vrittis in question and the payment of the arrears of allowance to the several Vrittidadars should be thoroughly gone into and disposed of once for all. Accordingly, when the file came up to me for orders I went fully into the case and expressed the following opinion:-

"I think that the several cases may now be disposed of as follows: "

(1) "Case of Sumathi Ananthachar.

"This gentleman constructed his house on the selected site in the year 1905-06 in accordance with the Government Order of August 1904; and though he had rented it for some time for a - school, it is said that the house is now occupied by one of the Brahmin Archaks of the Seringapatam temple in accordance with the order of Government. In the circumstances, the irregularity on his part in renting out the house to non-Brahmins for some years until it was pointed out by Government, may be condoned and his Vritti allowance, may be restored to him from 1905-06 when he -- completed the construction of his house and sanction may be accorded to the payment to him of the arrears from 1905-06 up to date after

deducting therefrom the amounts already advanced to him.

(2) "Lakshminarasimhachar.

21 "This gentleman is not strictly entitled to the restoration of his vritti, as he did not comply with the terms of the Government Order of August 1904 by building his house within the period of one year stipulated therein. However, as he constructed the -- house so far back as 1915-16, nearly 10 years ago, the delay on his part in completing it within the time prescribed in the order of 1904 may be condoned as a concession and his vritti allowance restored to him from the time of the completion of the house i.e., from 1915-16. The arrears of his allowance from 1915-16 may be paid to him after deducting therefrom the amounts already advanced to him.

"In the event of the payments already made to Ananthachar and Lakshminarasimhachar being in excess of the arrears due to them as mentioned above, such excess may be adjusted by short - drawal from payments that may become due to them in future years.

(3) "Other vrittidars.

"In respect of the other vrittidars who have not built houses till now, they will be considered to have completely forfeited their right to the restoration of their vritties and they will be called *

A. Narasimhiah	..	Rs. 500/-	0	on to repay the advances made
P. Subba Rao	..	Rs. 500/-	0	
Srinivasa Murthi	..	Rs. 500/-	0	to them for the years 1886-
Ananthamurthiachar	..	Rs. 500/-	0	
Kuppamma	..	Rs. 500/-	0	1894. The explanation of the

officers responsible for not enforcing the terms under which the advances were made will also be called for with a view to consider the question of enforcing their responsibility for making good the amount if it cannot be realised from the persons concerned.

"The next point is how the share of the annual vritti allowance due to Ananthachar and Lakshminarasimhachar is to be calculated after the village was taken over under Government management. In

the case of the vritties assigned to the temple and the chattram, they have been commuted into money payments at the rate of Rs.72/- per vritti after ^{that} the villages came under Government management, and I think both Ananthachar and Lakshminarasimhachar, may be paid at the same rate (Rs.72/- per annum) in respect of the vritti or vritties owned by each of them; and they may be declared to be entitled to this grant in hereditary succession so long as the houses are -- maintained in a habitable condition and are actually occupied by Brahmins. With a view to ensure that this condition is not infringed or lost sight of, it may be ordered that the payment of the grant at the rate of Rs.72/- per annum will be made at the Taluk Treasury once a quarter on the production of a certificate signed by the -- Vice President or President of the Seringapatam Municipality or by the Amildar of the Taluk, that the houses are in good and habitable condition and are occupied by Brahmins".

9. The Dewan has agreed to the above proposals of mine, and I submit them for the gracious approval of His Highness the Maharaja.

M. S. Ramaswami
FIRST MEMBER OF COUNCIL.

28-1-1926.

11-2-26

Submitted to His Highness.



*I submit herewith a Final Note by the FIRST
Member of Council on the subject of the claim of certain
Vrittidars of Nowl Krishna Doss Agrahar at Seringapatam, for
the restoration of their Vrittis and for the payment of arrears
of Vritti allowances
for His Highness' gracious approval.*


Dewan.

*2
17/2*

Subd to Acc Rev-
Coop

The revised draft
may (if only) be
initiated

M
S/4

Serial
No.

Dft. G.O. Submitted for approval

AV
19.3.1926. L.L. Secy
24. 1st Mr.

25/3

663
26.3

A new draft is put
in and kept for

See

5/11/26

25/3

I have suggested a few additions
and omissions in the draft - If they are
in order, the draft may be approved.

As provision has to be made in the budget
of next year, the draft may perhaps be
submitted to Dewan for perusal before
issue -

18. March

6.4.26.

181
7.4

Draft as revised is approved
The ~~draft~~ A draft typed draft
may be also, read & approved
in the

The draft may be approved
and I will send it to the
Dewan for perusal before
issue -

Proceedings of the Government of

H.H. the Maharaja of Mysore.

- - -

Read-

G.O. No. 963-6/G.199 dated 16th July 1894 directing that owing to the neglected condition of the charities founded by the late Nowl Krishna Doss in Paschimavahini, Seringapatam Taluk, the Inam villages of Turuganur and Basavanahalli in the T. Marsipur Taluk intended for the maintenance of these charities may be taken under Government management.

2. G.O. No. 9047-48/R. 1369 dated 2nd December 1894 directing, on representations made by the Vrittidars, that the question of restoring to them the Vrittis or their equivalents would be favourably considered, after they build their Agrahar houses in a locality approved by the Deputy Commissioner.

3. G.O. No. 797-8/Muz. 31-94 dated 25th December 1898 recognising the right of the several Agrahar inamdars to their respective shares in the income from the villages during the years 1886-1894 (during which the Inam was under Government management).

4. G.O. No. 745-6 dated 17th August 1904 giving a final chance to the several vrittidars to construct ~~wixhxone~~ within one year's time houses on the sites selected by the Deputy Commissioner at Seringapatam.

5. G.O. No. 3110-12/Muz. 696-15-11 dated 5th March 1921 directing that the arrears of vritti amounts held in deposit

Date of issue 17/4/26

Signed by Mr. N.

cannot be refunded to Sumati Anantachar, one of the vrittidars, as the Agrahar house built by him at Beringapatam intended for the quarters of a Brahmin had been rented out to a school.

6. Review application No.1103 dated 31st October 1922 from Sumati Anantachar, praying that on a reconsideration of the foregoing order, arrears of vritti amounts may be refunded to him and also his vritti may be restored to him.

.....
Order No. 1317-21 17/4/26
mar 264-22-9

The villages of Turuganur and Basavana-halli in the P. Narsipur Taluk were granted as Sarvamanya by H.H. the Maharaja Krishnaraja Wodeyar to Nowl Krishna Doss by Sanad dated 6th March 1820 for the maintenance of certain charitable institutions, viz., a chattram, a temple and an Agrahar at Paschimavahini. The villages ~~as~~ were registered during the Inam Settlement, as Devadaya grant to be held by the Manager for the time being, of the charities established by Nowl Krishna Doss. As the charities were neglected, and no Agrahar was built, the villages were taken under Govt. management in 1886 and subsequently resumed to Govt. in G.O. No.963-6/G.109 dated 16th July 1894.

2. On the representation made by the vrittidars it was directed in G.O. No.9047-48 P.1369 dated 2nd December 1894 that the question of restoring to them the vrittis or their equivalents would be favourably considered. after

after they build their Agrahar houses in a locality approved by the Deputy Commissioner and otherwise conform to the conditions of the original grant. In G.O. No.797-8/Muz.31-94 dated 25th December 1898, the right of the several Agrahar inamdars to their respective shares in the income from the villages during the years 1886-1894 (during which the Inam was under Government management) was recognised, and in their order No.745-6 dated 17th August 1904 Government authorised the Deputy Commissioner to advance to the vrittidars out of the arrears of vritti amount due to them for the years 1886-1894. such amounts as ^{might} ~~may~~ be required by them for building houses on the sites selected for the purpose at Serinapatam, after taking proper and adequate security therefor. It was also laid down that in case the vrittidars failed to build the Agrahar houses on the selected site within one year from the date of the order, the promise made in G.O. of 2nd December 1894 to restore the vrittis or their equivalents to the Inamdars would be withdrawn and cancelled.

3. Of the vrittidars only one viz., Sumati Anantachar built a house within one year as required by the order of ^{17th} August 1904. One other vrittidar Lakshminarasimhachar also built a house, but ^{it} ~~it~~ was ~~only~~ nearly 10 years after the lapse of the period of one year fixed by Government in their order ^{referred to} ~~of August~~ ^{a Government order} ~~1904~~ and the rest have not built houses even up to date.

4. Sumathi Ananthachar and Lakshminarasimhachar

referred to above having requested the restoration to them of the vrittis or their equivalents from the year 1894 as per G.O. of 2nd December 1894, ^{for in the order no} ~~G.O. No. 3~~ 110-12/11/1906-15-11 ⁸⁶⁵ of March 1921 ~~was passed declining~~ to restore the vrittis to Anantachar on the ground that though he had built a house within the stipulated time, he had rented it out to a girls' school instead of living in it or ^{at} ~~renting it out~~ ^{not} ~~at least~~ to a Brahmin in conformity to the terms of the grant & ~~and the~~ ^{ed} direct ~~the~~ payment to Lakshminarasimhachar of only the arrears of vritti amount for the years 1886 to 1894. Sumati Anantachar has ~~however~~, ~~again~~ approached Government for a reconsideration of the ^{above} ~~order of March 1921~~ stating that he has since rented out the building to a Brahmin, an Archak of the Sri Ranganathaswami temple.

5. Though it is only the review application of Sumati Anantachar that is now under consideration, Government consider it desirable that the whole question relating to the restoration of these Agrahar vrittis and the payment of arrears of vritti allowance should be thoroughly gone into and disposed of once for all and they are accordingly pleased to order as follows:-

(1) Case of Sumati Anantachar.

This vrittidar constructed a house in the year 1905-06 as directed in the G.O. of August 1904.

~~Things he had~~ ^{and had} rented it out to non-Brahmins for some ~~years, in view of the fact that Sumati was following an~~ ^{years} until it was pointed out to him by Govt.

~~he~~ ^{it} is now reported that ~~the house has been~~ ^{he has}

rented out to a Brahmin, Government are pleased

to direct that ~~the~~ ^{his} irregularity on the part of ~~in~~ ⁱⁿ ~~the~~ ^{the} vrittidar

~~renting as his house is non-Brahmin~~ ^{that} this vrittidar be condoned ~~and~~ ^{and} that his vritti

be restored to him ~~and that~~ ^{and} the ~~vritti~~ ^{arrear} allowances

~~was~~ from the year 1905-06 when the construction of the house was completed ^{being} paid to him, after deducting therefrom the amount that has already been advanced.

(2) Case of Lakshminarasimbachar.

Strictly speaking, this vrittidar is not entitled to the restoration of his vritti as he failed to build the house within the stipulated time of one year. However, as he has constructed a house, though nearly 10 years after the date fixed, Government are pleased to direct that the delay on his part in this respect be condoned ^{and} that the vritti be restored to him from the year 1915-16 when he completed the construction of the house ~~and that~~. The arrears of allowance ^{from 1915-16 until} be accordingly paid to him after deducting therefrom the amount that has already been advanced. In the event of the advances made to ^{the} above-mentioned vrittidars being in excess of the arrears due to them, such excess should be adjusted by ^{recourse to} ~~short payments~~ ^{of the} vritti amounts payable to them for future years.

(3) Cases of other vrittidars.

^{As} ~~None~~ of the remaining vrittidars ^{have} ~~built houses so far and have thus~~ failed to avail themselves of the concessions promised to them in the G.O. of 2nd December 1894, Government ~~therefore~~ direct that they be considered to have forfeited the claim to the restoration of their vrittis. ^{And he} called upon to repay the arrears of vritti amount for the years 1886-1894 that has ^{been already paid to them}.

finally /

2/11/1915

6. The next point is how the share of the annual vritti allowance payable to Anantachar and Lakshminarasimhachar in accordance with para 5 (1) and (2) above is to be calculated after the village was taken over under Govt. management. In the case of the vrittis assigned to the temple and the chattram, it is found that they have been commuted into money payments at the rate of Rs.72 per vritti, after the villages came under Govt. management. Govt. direct that both Anantachar and Lakshminarasimhachar be paid at the same rate (Rs.72 ^{Each} per annum ~~for each vritti~~) in respect of the vritti ~~or vritties~~ owned by each of them and that they be declared to be entitled to this grant in hereditary succession, so long as the houses are maintained in a habitable condition and are actually occupied by Brahmins with a view to ensure that these conditions ^{mentioned of} are not infringed or lost sight of, Govt. further direct that the payment of the grant every year should be made at the Taluk Treasury once a quarter on the production of a certificate signed by the Vice President or President of the Serinapatam Municipality or by the Amildar of the Taluk, that the houses are in good and habitable condition and are occupied by brahmins.

*Annual cash grant of Rs. 144 in 1926-27
are made to meet the vritti allowance
of Anantachar and Lakshminarasimhachar - No regards
are due to them for previous years as stated in subpara
(1) + (2) of para 5 and the allowance payable for the current
year, the Mysore Commission is requested to forward the
same to the Government for their consideration -
to report to Commission in the*

13 Apr 1926
J.
Vidya Sagar

Shri

An annual cash grant of Rs 144 will be made in the 8th
Mysore budget from the year 1926-7 to meet the vritti allowance
of Anantachar and Lakshminarasimhachar. No regards
are due to them for previous years as stated in subpara
(1) + (2) of para 5 and the allowance payable for the current
year, the Mysore Commission is requested to forward the
same to the Government for their consideration -
to report to Commission in the

My for also

into of the vritti collection, and how they are accounted for - A full statement of the advances made to Ananthachari & Subbarao & Subbarao, and of the vritti allowances payable to them according to this order to the end of June 1926 may also be submitted by the Mysore Comptroller within one month.

A. Narasimhiah
P. Subba Rao
Sreenivasa Moorthy
Ananthamoorthiachar
Kuppamma.

and to submit a
report to Govt.
within a period
of 3 months.

8/4/26
5

Print

BB

8/4/26

7. Of the vrittidars who have not built houses, it is observed that the marginally-noted persons have been given not only the arrears for the years 1886-1894 but also an advance of - Rs.500 each under G.O. No. 611-12 dated 31st July 1907 though under G.O. of 17th August 1901 they were to be given advances only to the extent of the vritti amounts due to them for the years 1886-1894 during which period the inam villages were under Government management. As these persons have not conformed to the conditions on which the payments were made, the Muzrai Commissioner is requested to have necessary action taken ^{early} to recover from these persons the advances paid to them ~~as also the arrears of vritti amount for the years 1886 to 1894 that has been disbursed to them as directed in sub para 3 of para 3 above~~

1/6/4
Secretary to Government,
Revenue Department.

The Muz. Commissioner in Mysore,
The Comptroller to Government,
The Deputy Commissioner, Mysore District,
The Supt., Revenue Survey & Settlement.
The Revenue Commissioner in Mysore.

copy To Financial Branch.

Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore.

GENERAL AND REVENUE DEPARTMENTS.

G. O. No. 1317-21—Muz. 264-22-9, dated 17th April 1926

Nowl Krishna Doss Sait's Charities.

Sanctions the restoration to Sumati Ananthachar and Lakshmi Nara-imhachar of their vrittis or their equivalents from the — at Paschimavahini.

READ—

Government Order No. 963-6—G. 199, dated the 16th July 1894, directing that owing to the neglected condition of the charities founded by the late Nowl Krishna Doss in Paschimavahini, Seringapatam Taluk, the Inam villages of Turuganur and Basavanahalli in the T.-Narsipur Taluk intended for the maintenance of these charities may be taken under Government management

2. Government Order No. 9047-48—R. 1369, dated 2nd December 1894, directing on representations made by the Vrittidadars, that the question of restoring to them the vrittis or their equivalents would be favourably considered, after they build their Agrahar houses in a locality approved by the Deputy Commissioner.

3. Government Order No. 797-8—Muz. 31-94, dated the 25th December 1898, recognising the right of the several Agrahar Inamdars to their respective shares in the income from the villages during the years 1886-1894 (during which the Inam was under Government Management).

4. Government Order No. 745-6, dated 17th August 1904, giving a final chance to the several vrittidadars to construct within one year's time houses on the sites at Seringapatam selected by the Deputy Commissioner.

5. Government Order No. 3110-12—Muz. 696-15-11, dated the 5th March 1921, directing that the arrears of vritti amounts held in deposit cannot be refunded to Sumati Anantachar, one of the Vrittidadars, as the Agrahar house built by him at Seringapatam intended for the quarters of a Brahmin had been rented out to a school.

6. Review application No. 1103, dated 31st October 1922, from Sumati Anantachar, praying that on a reconsideration of the foregoing order, arrears of vritti amounts may be refunded to him and also his vritti may be restored to him.

ORDER No. 1317-21—Muz. 264-22-9, DATED 17TH APRIL 1926.

The villages of Turuganur and Basavanahalli in the T.-Narsipur Taluk were granted as Sarvamanya by His Highness the Maharaja Krishnaraja Wodeyar to Nowl Krishna Doss by Sannad, dated 8th March 1820, for the maintenance of certain charitable institutions, viz., a chattram, a temple and an Agrahar at Paschimavahini. The villages were registered during the Inam Settlement, as Devadaya grant to be held by the Manager for the time being of the charities established by Nowl Krishna Doss. As the charities were neglected, and no Agrahar was built, the villages were taken under Government management in 1886 and subsequently resumed to Government in Government Order No. 963 6—G. 199, dated the 16th July 1894.

2. On the representation made by the Vrittidadars it was directed in Government Order No. 9047-48—R. 1369, dated 2nd December 1894, that the question of restoring to them the vrittis or their equivalents would be favourably considered after they build their Agrahar houses in a locality approved by the Deputy Commissioner and otherwise conform to the conditions of the original grant. In Government Order No. 797-8—Muz. 31 94, dated 25th December 1898, the right of the several Agrahar Inamdars to their respective shares in the income from the villages during the years 1886-1894 (during which the Inam

No. 1317-21—Muz. 264-22-9, DATED 17TH APRIL 1926.

was under Government management) was recognised, and in their order No. 745-6, dated 17th August 1904, Government authorised the Deputy Commissioner to advance to the Vrittidars out of the arrears of vritti amount due to them for the years 1886-1894 such amounts as might be required by them for building houses on the sites selected for the purpose at Seringapatam, after taking proper and adequate security therefor. It was also laid down that in case the Vrittidars failed to build the Agrahar houses on the selected site within one year from the date of the order, the promise made in Government Order of 2nd December 1894 to restore the vrittis or their equivalents to the inamdars would be withdrawn and cancelled.

3. Of the Vrittidars only one, *viz.*, Sumati Anantachar built a house within one year as required by the order of 17th August 1904, one other Vrittidar Lakshminarasimhachar also built a house, but this was nearly ten years after the lapse of the period of one year fixed by Government in the abovementioned order. The rest have not built houses even up to date.

4. Sumati Anantachar and Lakshminarasimhachar referred to above having requested the restoration to them of the vrittis or their equivalents from the year 1894, as per Government Order of 2nd December 1894, Government in their order No. 3110-12—Muz. 696-15-11, dated 5th March 1921, declined to restore the Vritti to Anantachar on the ground that though he had built a house within the stipulated time, he had rented it out to a Girls' School instead of living in it or renting it out to a Brahmin in conformity to the terms of the grant and they directed the payment to Lakshminarasimhachar of only the arrears of vritti amount for the years 1886 to 1894. Sumati Anantachar has approached Government for a reconsideration of the above order stating that he has since rented out the building to a Brahmin, an Archak of the Sri Ranganathaswami temple.

5. Though it is only the review application of Sumati Anantachar that is now under consideration, Government consider it desirable that the whole question relating to the restoration of these Agrahar Vrittis and the payment of arrears of vritti allowance should be thoroughly gone into and disposed of once for all and they are accordingly pleased to order as follows:—

1. *Case of Sumati Anantachar.*—This Vrittidar constructed a house in the year 1905-06 as directed in the Government Order of August 1904. Though he had rented it out to non-Brahmins for some years in view of the fact that since the irregularity was pointed out to him by Government he is reported to have rented it out to a Brahmin, Government are pleased to direct that the irregularity on his part in temporarily renting out his house to non-Brahmins be condoned and that his vritti be restored to him, the arrears of vritti allowances from the year 1905-06 when the construction of the house was completed being paid to him, after deducting therefrom the amount that has already been advanced.

2. *Case of Lakshminarasimhachar.*—Strictly speaking, this Vrittidar is not entitled to the restoration of his vritti as he failed to build the house within the stipulated time of one year. However, as he has constructed a house, though nearly 10 years after the date fixed, Government are pleased to direct that the delay on his part in this respect be condoned and that the vritti be restored to him from the year 1915-16 when he completed the construction of the house. The arrears of allowance from 1915-16 will be accordingly paid to him after deducting therefrom the amount that has already been advanced.

In the event of the advances made to either of the above mentioned Vrittidars being in excess of the arrears due to them, such excess should be adjusted by short payments of the Vritti amounts payable to them for future years.

3. *Cases of other Vrittidars.*—As the remaining Vrittidars have not built houses up to now and thereby failed to avail themselves of the concessions promised to them in the Government Order of 2nd December 1894, Government direct that they be considered to have finally forfeited the claim to the restoration of their vrittis.

6. The next point is how the share of the annual vritti allowance payable to Anantachar and Lakshminarasimhachar in accordance with para 5 (1) and (2) above is to be calculated after the village was taken over under Government management. In the case of the vrittis assigned to the temple and the chattram, it is found that they have been commuted into money payments at the rate of Rs. 72 per vritti, after the villages came under Government management. Government direct that both Anantachar and Lakshminarasimhachar be paid at the same rate (Rs. 72 each per annum) in respect of the vritti owned by each of them and that they be declared to be entitled to this grant in hereditary succession, so long as the houses are maintained in a habitable condition and are actually occupied by Brahmins. With a view to ensure that the conditions mentioned above are not infringed or lost sight of, Government further direct that the payment of the grants every year should be made at the Taluk Treasury once a quarter on the production of a certificate signed by the Vice-President or President of the Seringapatam Municipality or

No. 1317-21—MUZ. 264-22-9, DATED 17TH APRIL 1926.

by the Amildar of the Taluk, that the houses are in good and habitable condition and are occupied by Brahmins. An annual cash grant of Rs. 144 will be made in the State Muzrai Budget commencing from the year 1926-27 to meet the vritti allowances of Anantachar and Lakshminarasimhachar. As regards the arrears due to them for previous years as stated in sub-para (1) and (2) of para 5 and the allowances payable for the current year, the Muzrai Commissioner is requested to report in communication with the Deputy Commissioner, Mysore, what amount is available out of the vritti collections, and how they are accounted for. A full statement of the advances made to Anantachar and Lakshminarasimhachar, and of the vritti allowances payable to them according to this order to the end of June 1926 may also be submitted by the Muzrai Commissioner within one month.

7. Of the Vrittidars who have not built houses, it is observed that the marginally noted persons have been given not only the arrears for the years 1886-1894 but also an advance of Rs. 500 each under Government Order No. 611-12, dated 31st July 1907 though, under Government Order of 17th August 1904, they were to be given advances only to the extent of the vritti amounts due to them for the years 1886-1894 during which period the Inam villages were under Government management. As these persons have not conformed to the conditions on which the payments were made, the Muzrai Commissioner is requested to have necessary action taken early to recover from these persons the advances paid to them and to submit a report to Government within a period of three months.

- 1 A. Narasimhaiah.
- 2 P. Subba Rao.
- 3 Sreenivasa Murthi
- 4 Nantamurthiachar
- 5 Kuppamma

B. SRINIVASA IYENGAR,
*Secretary to Government,
Revenue Department.*

To—The Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore.
The Comptroller to the Government of Mysore.
The Deputy Commissioner, Mysore District
The Superintendent, Revenue Survey and Settlement.
The Revenue Commissioner in Mysore

Exd.—P. S. R. N.